1 2 3 4 5 6 6 7 7 8 7 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 11 CORNELIO VEDOLLA ESPINOZA, 1:10-cv-01521-LJO-SKO (HC) 12 Petitioner, 0RDER DENVING MOTION FOR 13 vs. APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL 14 MIKE MCDONALD, (DOCUMENT #26) 15 Respondent. 16					
3 4 4 5 6 7 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 LASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 11 CORNELIO VEDOLLA ESPINOZA, 1:10-ev-01521-LJO-SKO (HC) 12 Petitioner, ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL 13 vs. APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL 14 MIKE MCDONALD, (DOCUMENT #26) 15 Respondent. 16	1	1			
4 5 6 7 8 10 11 12 13 14 15 15 16 17 18 19 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 11 11 12 13 14 15 15 16 17 17 18 19 111 111 112 113 114 115 115 116 117 118 119 111 111 111 111 111 111 <td>2</td> <td>2</td> <td></td>	2	2			
5 6 7 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 1 11 CORNELIO VEDOLLA ESPINOZA, 1:10-ev-01521-LJO-SKO (HC) 12 Petitioner, ORDER DENVING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL 13 vs. APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL 14 MIKE MCDONALD, (DOCUMENT #26) 15 Respondent. 16	3	3			
6 7 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 CORNELIO VEDOLLA ESPINOZA, 1:10-ex-01521-LJO-SKO (HC) 12 Petitioner, ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR 13 Vs. APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL 14 MIKE MCDONALD, (DOCUMENT #26) 15 Respondent. (DOCUMENT #26) 16	4	4			
7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 CORNELIO VEDOLLA ESPINOZA, 1:10-cv-01521-LJO-SKO (HC) 11 CORNELIO VEDOLLA ESPINOZA, 1:10-cv-01521-LJO-SKO (HC) 12 Petitioner, ORDER DENVING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL 13 Nike MCDONALD, (DOCUMENT #26) 14 MIKE MCDONALD, (DOCUMENT #26) 15 Respondent. 16	5	5			
Note Number of course of particity of partity of particity of parti	6	5			
9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 CORNELIO VEDOLLA ESPINOZA, 1:10-cv-01521-LJO-SKO (HC) 12 Petitioner, ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL 13 vs. APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL 14 MIKE MCDONALD, DOCUMENT #26) 15 Respondent. 16	7	7			
10 11 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 19 11 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 17 18 19 19 10 110 111 <tr< th=""><td>8</td><td colspan="2">UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT</td></tr<>	8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
11 CORNELIO VEDOLLA ESPINOZA, 1:10-cv-01521-LJO-SKO (HC) 12 Petitioner, ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR 13 vs. APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL 14 MIKE MCDONALD, (DOCUMENT #26) 15 Respondent. 16	9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
12 Petitioner, ORDER DENVING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL 13 vs. APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL 14 MIKE MCDONALD, (DOCUMENT #26) 15 Respondent. 16 / 17 Petitioner has requested the appointment of counsel. There currently exists no 18 absolute right to appointment of counsel in habeas proceedings. See, e.g., Anderson v. Heinze, 19 258 F.2d 479, 481 (9th Cir. 1958); Mitchell v. Wyrick, 727 F.2d 773, 774 (8th Cir. 1984). 10 However, 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B) authorizes the appointment of counsel at any stage of 11 the case if "the interests of justice so require." See Rule 8(c), Rules Governing Section 2254 12 Cases. In the present case, the Court does not find that the interests of justice require the 13 appointment of counsel at the present time. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that 14 Petitioner's request for appointment of counsel is denied. 15 IT IS SO ORDERED. 16 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 17 August 4, 2011 /s/ Sheila K. Oberto	10				
13 vs. ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL 14 MIKE MCDONALD, (DOCUMENT #26) 15 Respondent. 16 / 17 Petitioner has requested the appointment of counsel. There currently exists no 18 absolute right to appointment of counsel in habeas proceedings. See, e.g., Anderson v. Heinze, 19 258 F.2d 479, 481 (9th Cir. 1958); Mitchell v. Wyrick, 727 F.2d 773, 774 (8th Cir. 1984). 20 However, 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B) authorizes the appointment of counsel at any stage of 21 the case if "the interests of justice so require." See Rule 8(c), Rules Governing Section 2254 22 Cases. In the present case, the Court does not find that the interests of justice require the 23 appointment of counsel at the present time. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that 24 Petitioner's request for appointment of counsel is denied. 25 IT IS SO ORDERED. 26 Dated:August 4, 2011/s/ Sheila K. Oberto 27 WITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	11	1 CORNELIO VEDOLLA ESPINOZA,	1:10-cv-01521-LJO-SKO (HC)		
13 vs. APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL 14 MIKE MCDONALD, Respondent. (DOCUMENT #26) 15 Respondent. 16 / 17 Petitioner has requested the appointment of counsel. There currently exists no 18 absolute right to appointment of counsel in habeas proceedings. See, e.g., Anderson v. Heinze, 19 258 F.2d 479, 481 (9th Cir. 1958); Mitchell v. Wyrick, 727 F.2d 773, 774 (8th Cir. 1984). 20 However, 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B) authorizes the appointment of counsel at any stage of 21 the case if "the interests of justice so require." See Rule 8(c), Rules Governing Section 2254 22 Cases. In the present case, the Court does not find that the interests of justice require the 23 appointment of counsel at the present time. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that 24 Petitioner's request for appointment of counsel is denied. 25 IT IS SO ORDERED. 26 Dated:August 4, 2011/s/ Sheila K. Oberto 27 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	12	2 Petitioner,	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL		
15 Respondent. 16 / 17 Petitioner has requested the appointment of counsel. There currently exists no 18 absolute right to appointment of counsel in habeas proceedings. See, e.g., Anderson v. Heinze, 19 258 F.2d 479, 481 (9th Cir. 1958); Mitchell v. Wyrick, 727 F.2d 773, 774 (8th Cir. 1984). 20 However, 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B) authorizes the appointment of counsel at any stage of 21 the case if "the interests of justice so require." See Rule 8(c), Rules Governing Section 2254 22 Cases. In the present case, the Court does not find that the interests of justice require the 23 appointment of counsel at the present time. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that 24 Petitioner's request for appointment of counsel is denied. 25 IT IS SO ORDERED. 26 Dated: August 4, 2011 //S/ Sheila K. Oberto 27 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	13	3 vs.			
15 Respondent. 16 / 17 Petitioner has requested the appointment of counsel. There currently exists no 18 absolute right to appointment of counsel in habeas proceedings. See, e.g., Anderson v. Heinze, 19 258 F.2d 479, 481 (9th Cir. 1958); Mitchell v. Wyrick, 727 F.2d 773, 774 (8th Cir. 1984). 20 However, 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B) authorizes the appointment of counsel at any stage of 21 the case if "the interests of justice so require." See Rule 8(c), Rules Governing Section 2254 22 Cases. In the present case, the Court does not find that the interests of justice require the 23 appointment of counsel at the present time. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that 24 Petitioner's request for appointment of counsel is denied. 25 IT IS SO ORDERED. 26 Dated:	14	4 MIKE MCDONALD,	(DOCUMENT #26)		
17 Petitioner has requested the appointment of counsel. There currently exists no 18 absolute right to appointment of counsel in habeas proceedings. See, e.g., Anderson v. Heinze, 19 258 F.2d 479, 481 (9th Cir. 1958); Mitchell v. Wyrick, 727 F.2d 773, 774 (8th Cir. 1984). 20 However, 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B) authorizes the appointment of counsel at any stage of 21 the case if "the interests of justice so require." See Rule 8(c), Rules Governing Section 2254 22 Cases. In the present case, the Court does not find that the interests of justice require the 23 appointment of counsel at the present time. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that 24 Petitioner's request for appointment of counsel is denied. 25 IT IS SO ORDERED. 26 Dated: August 4, 2011 /s/ Sheila K. Oberto 27 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	15	5 Respondent.			
 absolute right to appointment of counsel in habeas proceedings. See, e.g., Anderson v. Heinze, 258 F.2d 479, 481 (9th Cir. 1958); Mitchell v. Wyrick, 727 F.2d 773, 774 (8th Cir. 1984). However, 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B) authorizes the appointment of counsel at any stage of the case if "the interests of justice so require." See Rule 8(c), Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. In the present case, the Court does not find that the interests of justice require the appointment of counsel at the present time. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Petitioner's request for appointment of counsel is denied. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: <u>August 4, 2011</u> /s/ Sheila K. Oberto UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 	16	/			
 258 F.2d 479, 481 (9th Cir. 1958); <u>Mitchell v. Wyrick</u>, 727 F.2d 773, 774 (8th Cir. 1984). However, 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B) authorizes the appointment of counsel at any stage of the case if "the interests of justice so require." <u>See</u> Rule 8(c), Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. In the present case, the Court does not find that the interests of justice require the appointment of counsel at the present time. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Petitioner's request for appointment of counsel is denied. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: <u>August 4, 2011</u> /s/ Sheila K. Oberto UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 	17	7 Petitioner has requested the appointment of	Petitioner has requested the appointment of counsel. There currently exists no		
 However, 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B) authorizes the appointment of counsel at any stage of the case if "the interests of justice so require." See Rule 8(c), Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. In the present case, the Court does not find that the interests of justice require the appointment of counsel at the present time. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Petitioner's request for appointment of counsel is denied. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: <u>August 4, 2011</u> /s/ Sheila K. Oberto UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 	18	absolute right to appointment of counsel in habeas proceedings. See, e.g., Anderson v. Heinze,			
 the case if "the interests of justice so require." See Rule 8(c), Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. In the present case, the Court does not find that the interests of justice require the appointment of counsel at the present time. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Petitioner's request for appointment of counsel is denied. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: August 4, 2011 /s/ Sheila K. Oberto UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 	19	258 F.2d 479, 481 (9th Cir. 1958); Mitchell v. Wyrick, 727 F.2d 773, 774 (8th Cir. 1984).			
 Cases. In the present case, the Court does not find that the interests of justice require the appointment of counsel at the present time. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Petitioner's request for appointment of counsel is denied. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: <u>August 4, 2011</u> /s/ Sheila K. Oberto UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 	20	However, 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B) authorizes the appointment of counsel at any stage of			
 appointment of counsel at the present time. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Petitioner's request for appointment of counsel is denied. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: <u>August 4, 2011</u> /s/ Sheila K. Oberto UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 	21	the case if "the interests of justice so require." See Rule 8(c), Rules Governing Section 2254			
 Petitioner's request for appointment of counsel is denied. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: <u>August 4, 2011</u> /s/ Sheila K. Oberto UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 	22	Cases. In the present case, the Court does not find that the interests of justice require the			
 25 IT IS SO ORDERED. 26 Dated: <u>August 4, 2011</u> /s/ Sheila K. Oberto UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 27 	23	appointment of counsel at the present time. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that			
26 Dated: August 4, 2011 /s/ Sheila K. Oberto 27 VNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	24	Petitioner's request for appointment of counsel is denied.			
27 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	25	5 IT IS SO ORDERED.			
27	26				
28	27				
	28	3			